UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,462	03/24/2006	Takuya Kinoshita	NNA-241-B	2578
48980 YOUNG BASI	7590 12/20/201 LE	0	EXAMINER	
3001 WEST BIG BEAVER ROAD			CULLEN, SEAN P	
	SUITE 624 TROY, MI 48084		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1725	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/20/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@youngbasile.com audit@youngbasile.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/573,462	KINOSHITA ET AL.		
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Sean P. Cullen, Ph.D.	1725		
All Participants:	Status of Application: Per	<u>nding</u>		
(1) <u>Sean P. Cullen, Ph.D.</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Francine B. Nesti</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>13 December 2010</u>	Time: <u>10:00 a.m.</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 U.S.C. 102(a and e)				
Claims discussed: 1,13-15 and 17				
Prior art documents discussed: Nagayama et al. (U.S. 2005/208347 A1)				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENEF See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)				

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' representative clarified the applicants' position regarding the arguments with respect to Nagayama et al. Applicants' representative was not arguing that the instant claims define a discharge circuit printed on the positive/negative active material or the ion conduction material. The discharge circuit is printed on a layer that comprises a negative/positive active material or ion conduction material. Applicants' representative argued the Nagayama et al. does not disclose a discharge circuit printed on a negative electrode layer, positive electrode layer or electolyte layer because the diodes of Nagayama et al. are formed on a collector. The Examiner argued that the claim language does not preclude the discharge circuit being formed on a collector. A discharge circuit printed on the electrolyte layer would be formed within the the negative/positive electrode layer and thus be formed on the collector. The Examiner also argued the Nagayama discloses a discharge circuit within the negative electrode layer and thus is formed (i.e., printed) on the electrolyte layer. No agreement was reached. The applicants' representative argued that Nagayama explicitly discloses that the diodes are formed on the collector. The Examiner arged that the method of making is not given patentable weight in a product claim and the product of Nagayama anticipates the instant claim. Nagayam discloses a group of diodes formed on the collector and an electrolyte layer is interposed between collectors. Thus, the cell of Nagayama discloses a group of diodes (i.e., discharge circuit) formed on an electrolyte layer. No agreement was reached.